



3.169 ↓ 144 13 0

...

PDF

Cite

History

Share

## Altmetric Score



## Tags

- Regulation
- mRNA-vaccines
- mRNA
- Anti-cancer-vaccine
- Pro-vaccine
- EMA
- FDA
- WHO
- Regulatory agencies
- Pharmacokinetics

## Article rating

☆☆☆☆ 3.69 | 13 reviewers

Review this Article

Article Mar 7, 2023

Qeios ID: WW4UEN.2

Open Access CC BY

<https://doi.org/10.32388/WW4UEN.2>

# mRNA: vaccine or gene therapy? The safety issues of regulation

Preprint v2

Helene Banoun

Declarations

## Abstract

According to health agencies (EMA, European Medicines Agency, US-FDA, Food and Drug Administration-US, WHO), vaccines in general escape some of the controls required for human drugs and this without scientific justification: they are not generally subject to pharmacokinetic studies for example except in special cases. However, according to the EMA, vaccines are subject to the regulations for human drugs, which require pharmacokinetic studies when a new route of administration or a new adjuvant is used.

However, mRNA vaccines, which represent a new class of vaccine, should undergo more scrutiny than conventional vaccines because they are based on several new technologies. mRNAs should also be considered as prodrugs because the injected substance is not the substance causing active immunization; according to the FDA it is necessary to study how a prodrug contributes to the final toxicity and how it is transformed into an active substance.

In addition, mRNAs used for protection against infectious disease are excluded from the regulation of gene therapy products (GTPs); this exclusion is not scientifically justified by the regulatory agencies. GTPs are subject to controls that mRNA vaccines are not: studies on biodistribution, doses, potential target of toxicity, identification of the target organ to obtain biological activity, research on integration into the genome and transmission in the germ line, toxicity related to the expression of structurally altered proteins, reproductive toxicity, repeated toxicity, and excretion in the environment. This is of concern because conventional vaccines could be replaced by mRNA vaccines and anti-cancer "vaccines" (actually therapies) are being announced.

The FDA and the EMA have evaluated anti-Covid mRNA vaccines but the heads of these agencies have been pressured to approve them. The state military's handling of the Covid health crisis needs to be discussed in terms of its consequences and may explain this lack of oversight. It should also be discussed in the future whether all mRNA products should be subject to the same regulations and controls whether they are considered vaccines or not: it is not justifiable to subject therapeutic mRNAs to strict controls when they are intended for patients representing a small proportion of the human population and to exclude mRNA vaccines intended for the majority of the healthy human population.

**Hélène Banoun, PhD***Pharmacist biologist, Former Inserm researcher*

**Keywords:** regulation, mRNA-vaccines, mRNA, anti-cancer-vaccine, pro-vaccine, EMA, FDA, WHO, regulatory agencies, pharmacokinetics.

## Introduction

The regulation of medicines and vaccines is a little-known but very important subject.

Indeed, health products must undergo very strict controls in principle to control their efficacy and safety profile. Vaccines in general are part of human medicines according to the EMA and must therefore undergo the controls pertaining to these products <sup>[1]</sup>. The EMA also requires additional studies for vaccines using new formulations: we will see that these have not been conducted. Vaccines have been exempt from some of these controls for a long time without any real scientific justification. However, mRNA vaccines, which represent a new class of vaccine, should be subject to more controls than conventional vaccines because they are based on several new technologies <sup>[2]</sup>. Although incompletely defined, the mode of action of mRNA vaccines <sup>[3]</sup> should make them classified as gene therapy

products <sup>[4]</sup>. Furthermore, mRNAs should be considered as prodrugs according to the FDA definition. However, neither the FDA nor the EMA make any reference to this qualification. We will see that mRNAs used for protection against an infectious disease are excluded from the regulation of gene therapy products by both the FDA and the EMA. This allows them to escape the controls that are necessary for new products using many new techniques: "The current guidelines either do not apply, do not mention RNA therapeutics, or do not have widely accepted definition" <sup>[5]</sup>.

This is all the more true since manufacturers are planning to replace certain "classic" vaccines with mRNA vaccines <sup>[3]</sup>, starting with influenza vaccines: Indeed, Sanofi is launching the clinical trial of the first mRNA-based seasonal flu vaccine candidate <sup>[6]</sup> and Moderna has many mRNA vaccines in clinical trials (Covid, influenza, Human metapneumovirus, parainfluenzae, RSV, HCoV, CMV, EBV, HSV, varicella, Herpes, HIV, Zika, Nipah) particularly the phase 3 trial of the flu vaccine <sup>[7]</sup>. For these flu vaccines, emergency approval should not apply and the requirement for these additional studies should not be exceeded.

In addition, cancer "vaccines" are being announced <sup>[8]</sup> (e.g. Moderna & Merck are partnering in trials of mRNA-4157/V940, an anti-melanoma "vaccine" combined with Keytruda (a monoclonal antibody directed against the programmed cell death receptor (PD-1) and acts by enhancing the ability of the body's immune system to detect and fight tumor cells, by blocking the interaction between PD-1 and its ligands, PD-L1 and PD-L2, thereby activating the anti-T cell response, particularly antitumor. <sup>[8]</sup>

We must be very vigilant about the term vaccine associated with therapeutic drugs, particularly with regard to the regulations that apply to them.

## Definitions: pro-vaccine, pro-drug, GMP (good manufacturing practices), pharmacokinetics

According to the definition of the ANSM (Agence Nationale de Sécurité du Médicament, National Agency for the Safety of Medicines, France) <sup>[9]</sup>, a vaccine is a preventive medicine composed of one or more active substances of biological origin called antigens administered in order to protect against a disease; I will not discuss.

mRNA vaccines can be considered as pro-vaccines; this is a neologism modelled on the word pro-drug which designates a drug which, after administration, is converted by the organism into a pharmacologically active drug. In fact, according to the principle of mRNA, this must be translated into protein by the cells of the person vaccinated (the injected substance is not the substance causing an active immunization).

According to the FDA <sup>[10]</sup>, mRNA vaccines correspond to the Type I A of prodrugs, which are substances that are converted by cells into active drugs (and which include nucleoside analogues of antivirals). The FDA points out the particular problems of prodrugs raised by the more or less complete conversion into an active substance and the question of toxicity. According to the FDA, it is necessary to define how the prodrug contributes significantly to the toxicity profile of the active drug and this in particular depending on the site of transformation and action. For mRNA vaccines, biological transformation occurs in many cell types and in all organs, whereas the desired goal, i.e. immunization, will only occur in immune cells. However, mRNA vaccines are not classified as prodrugs and therefore escape these controls.

In general, the regulation of a drug concerns the good manufacturing practices (GMP). These GMP are detailed in an EMA document of 2001 updated in 2012 which applies to all human drugs including vaccines [1, Annex I]. These GMPs concern, among other things and for preclinical studies, (see Annex I of the document <sup>[6]</sup>), the assessment of environmental risks, the characterization of the product and raw materials, their control and stability, manufacturing methods, pharmacology (mode of action), toxicity, carcinogenicity, reproductive and embryo/fetal toxicity, pharmacokinetics, pharmacodynamics (modification of physiology by the drug), efficacy and product safety. The WHO recommends the same type of controls for vaccines in general <sup>[11]</sup>.

The pharmacokinetics is the action of the organism on a drug, i.e. the fate of the drug, from its entry to its exit from the organism, the evolution according to time of its absorption, its bioavailability, its distribution, its metabolism and its excretion.

We will see that these absolutely new products have not undergone all these controls.

## Regulatory status of mRNA vaccines

The regulation of mRNA vaccines at the federal (US-FDA), European (EMA) and international (WHO) levels is complex, unclear and contradictory. The anti-Covid mRNA vaccines are the first mRNA vaccines marketed and no specific regulations existed before the year 2020. It is therefore necessary to refer to previous more general regulations and try to find the

paragraphs that may relate to them. To solve this regulatory problem, WHO published a draft guidance document on December 20, 2020, for the assessment of quality, safety, and efficacy of mRNA vaccines, which includes the manufacture and control of vaccines as well as their non-clinical evaluation <sup>[12]</sup>. WHO admitted that detailed information was not available for the production of COVID-19 mRNA vaccines. In addition, safety and efficacy controls for gene-based biologics were not standardized, and some details remained proprietary and were not publicly disclosed. Given these uncertainties, WHO felt that it was not possible to develop specific international guidelines or recommendations and that some regulatory flexibility was needed.

## mRNA vaccines are not subject to regulation as gene therapy products

One might have thought *a priori* that mRNAs could be subject to the regulation of gene therapy products (GTP), to which they objectively correspond <sup>[4]</sup> (*"Gene therapy products are all products that mediate their effects by transcription and/or translation of transferred genetic material and/or by integrating into the host genome and that are administered as nucleic acids, viruses, or genetically engineered microorganisms."*). But already in 2007 the FDA distinguished between DNA plasmid vaccines according to whether they were for the prophylaxis of an infectious disease or not: DNA plasmids without indication in infectious diseases were subject to the regulation of gene therapy products, DNA plasmid vaccines against infectious diseases were subject to a separate regulation <sup>[13]</sup> and in 2013 the FDA confirmed that the regulation of gene therapy products did not apply to vaccines against infectious diseases <sup>[14]</sup>.

According to European Union (EU) legislation, RNA-based medicines can currently be classified into different regulatory statuses, depending, for vaccines, on their target (infectious disease or not) and, for other medicines, on the way they are obtained (chemically or biologically) <sup>[15]</sup>. This classification determines the controls and studies that must be carried out to obtain marketing authorizations. Thus, mRNA vaccines against infectious diseases are not classified as gene therapy products [1, Section M9 2.1 b] and <sup>[16]</sup> whereas mRNA vaccines for the treatment of cancers are GTMPs (Gene therapy medicinal products which are part of ATMPs, advanced therapeutic medicinal products), in fact mRNAs are GTMPs according to the CAT (Committee for Advanced Therapies) and must therefore undergo complete pharmacokinetic studies <sup>[17]</sup>.

It is therefore surprising that Moderna and BioNTech expected to have their products regulated as gene therapies. Moderna, Inc. acknowledged in its Q2 2020 Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) filing that *"currently, mRNA is considered a gene therapy product by the FDA"* <sup>[18]</sup>. Furthermore, BioNTech founder Ugur Sahin, in a 2014 article, stated *"One would expect the classification of an mRNA drug to be a biologic, gene therapy, or somatic cell therapy"* <sup>[19]</sup>.

Thus, the status of Covid mRNA vaccines was not well understood by the manufacturers themselves.

## What regulations are mRNA vaccines subject to?

The 2005 WHO guidelines <sup>[11]</sup> grant nucleic acid-based vaccines the status of vaccines (*"antigens produced in vivo in the vaccinated host following administration of a live vector or nucleic acid or antigens produced by chemical synthesis in vitro"*). Thus Covid mRNA vaccines must comply with this international regulation concerning GMP (good manufacturing practices), in particular the demonstration of the purity and quality of the raw material; it is specified that a pharmacodynamic study may also extend to the pharmacology of an adjuvant and that distribution studies must be considered in the case of new formulations. When a new additive is to be used, for which toxicological data are not available, toxicity studies of the additive alone should first be performed and the results documented in accordance with the guidelines for new chemical entities.

For Europe it is the 2001 document amended in 2012 that applies for the EMA to evaluate these mRNA vaccines as all vaccines (see Title 1 "Definitions" <sup>[1]</sup>). This document requires the declaration of the conformity of the raw materials, the composition of the product, stability studies of the active substances, pharmacokinetic studies (and pharmacology, e.g. quantitative composition, description of the manufacturing process, raw materials not listed in a pharmacopoeia, identification and assay of the active substance, in vitro or in vivo test of biological activity if assaying in the finished product is not possible, (tolerable deviation of 5% in the content of the active substance) For a new excipient refer to M2 3.2.2.4 d). Pharmacokinetics includes the study of absorption, distribution, biotransformation and excretion; *"Pharmacokinetic studies are usually not required for vaccines. However, such studies might be applicable when new delivery systems are employed or when the vaccine contains novel adjuvants or excipients."* <sup>[20]</sup>. According to a 2016 document <sup>[21]</sup>, for the EMA, the regulations should follow those of the WHO. For vaccines containing free DNA the EMA

asks to refer to the 2008 document <sup>[22]</sup>. This document refers to DNA plasmid vaccines (without specifying whether they are intended for use against an infectious disease or not). The nucleic acid vehicle is discussed and should be studied like other vaccine vehicles. So in contradiction to the exclusion of infectious disease vaccines from this regulation of gene products, they do seem to be subject to it here: *"Biodistribution studies should provide data on all organs, whether target or not, as recommended in annex A to the Note for guidance on repeated dose toxicity (CPMP/SWP/1042/99) and include investigation on GTMP persistence, mobilisation and shedding. Generally, for this purpose, data obtained from transgene/expression vector are sufficient. Observation time should cover persistence of signal (i.e. duration of transgene expression and activity) and include time-points for which there is no signal detection, if applicable. The dosing should mimic the clinical use with appropriate safety margins. Data collected in these studies might also contribute to the environmental risk assessment (ERA)."*

## Why are mRNA vaccines excluded from the regulation of gene products?

According to Guerriaud and Kohli <sup>[15]</sup>, *it is difficult to answer with certainty why vaccines against infectious diseases have been excluded. The definition [of vaccines] has not changed since 1975, a period when there was no "vaccine" against cancer* <sup>[1]</sup>: they are agents capable of producing active immunity against an infectious disease. At that time the only existing vaccines were against infectious diseases and the current definition of a vaccine is limited to an immunological drug against an infectious disease. Therefore, an anti-cancer drug can in no way be called a "vaccine". It should be noted that therapeutic AIDS vaccines based on lentiviruses and acting as gene therapies because they integrate into the genome have also been excluded from gene therapies <sup>[23]</sup>. From a public health point of view, and knowing (see below) that the classification as a "vaccine" allows the vaccine mRNA to escape the stricter controls of GMPs, one could object that a product intended for a majority of the world's healthy population should be subject to more stringent regulation than a gene therapy product intended for a few rare people suffering from a rare disease or cancer (this time concerning millions of people). Moreover, according to the EMA <sup>[21]</sup>, *"Since vaccines in most cases are given to large numbers of healthy individuals, there is a need for a solid nonclinical safety evaluation."*

## Regulatory studies for GTMPs were thus avoided for mRNA vaccines

The EMA regulation that should be referred to for these products and which does not concern RNA but only DNA (because it was drafted in 2008 <sup>[24]</sup>) requires extensive studies on both the nucleic acid and the vector particle/delivery system that include biodistribution, dose study, potential target toxicity, identification of the target organ to obtain biological activity, research into integration in the genome ("even if this integration is unlikely") and transmission in the germ line, toxicity linked to the expression of structurally altered proteins, reproductive toxicity (ICH M3 regulation), repeated toxicity, excretion in the environment <sup>[25]</sup>.

Concerning the US-FDA, one should refer to the CBER (Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research) guide in charge of regulating these products but which only issues non-binding recommendations <sup>[26]</sup> as well as to the 2013 instructions <sup>[27]</sup> which globally impose the same criteria as the EMA.

The anti-COVID-19 mRNA vaccines have escaped all these controls, although they are essential for a new formulation and a new principle of action.

## Conclusion

COVID-19 mRNA vaccines have been excluded, like all vaccines against infectious diseases, from the regulation of gene products of which they are objectively part. There is therefore no scientific justification to support this exclusion of vaccine mRNAs from the strict control rules that should apply for gene products (and prodrugs). This is all the more true since mRNA vaccines are destined to become widespread, as are mRNA therapies: it is to be feared that this exclusion creates a precedent that could also exclude mRNA therapies from strict controls. These safety controls are absolutely essential for this new technology, which presents risks of specific toxicity, integration in the genome, transmission in the germ line, toxicity linked to the expression of structurally altered proteins, reproductive toxicity, repeated toxicity and excretion in the environment <sup>[25]</sup>.

Why hasn't the FDA really evaluated these vaccines unlike the EMA?

In 2021, senior FDA officials resigned because they felt excluded from key decisions on Covid vaccines <sup>[28]</sup>. According to leaked EMA documents, U.S. and EU government officials pressured European drug regulators to quickly approve Pfizer-BioNTech's COVID-19 vaccine, despite safety concerns <sup>[29]</sup>. The management of the Covid health crisis by the state military apparatus must be discussed in terms of its consequences and may explain this control

failure: the various measures in response to the Covid pandemic were considered in the USA (and perhaps elsewhere?) as countermeasures against a biological weapon that did not require any clinical trials or proof of safety or efficacy. The US Health and Human Services (HHS) has stated <sup>[30]</sup> that COVID-19 countermeasures would be governed by the Public Readiness and Emergency Preparedness (PREP) Act <sup>[31]</sup>, which provides immunity "from liability (except for willful misconduct)...to entities and persons involved in the development, manufacture, testing, distribution, administration, and use of countermeasures." In the framework of this PREP Act, the US Department of Defense (DoD) took charge of the development and testing of the COVID-19 vaccines (see the contracts between the DoD and industry obtained by FOIA through KEI <sup>[32]</sup>)

In France, too, the health crisis was managed by the military: the Conseil de Défense Sanitaire is responsible for "taking crisis decisions in the health field" <sup>[33]</sup><sup>[34]</sup>. The existence of this state body is not defined either in the law or in the Constitution <sup>[35]</sup>. In Europe, the regulation of 14 April 2020 <sup>[36]</sup> with retroactive effect to 1 February 2020, and applicable until 31 January 2022, activates emergency aid under the Council regulation <sup>[37]</sup> which is intended to respond to a severe threat of disaster of natural or artificial origin (man-made). Eligible actions include the organization of ad hoc clinical trials of potential therapies or diagnostics according to trial standards agreed at the Union level, the list being non-exhaustive. This regulation also provides for the scientific validation of medical products including new test methods. This makes it possible to escape the usual standards of good manufacturing practices (GMP). All these actions are called countermeasures.

In the future, it should be discussed whether all mRNA-based products should be subject to the same regulations and controls, whether or not they are considered vaccines: it is not justifiable to subject therapeutic mRNAs to strict controls when they are intended for patients representing a small proportion of the human population, and to exclude mRNA vaccines intended for the majority of the human population in good health.

## References

- <sup>a, b, c</sup>EMA, 2001 Directive 2001/83/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 6 November 2001 on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use, updated on 16.11.2012 <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/en/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A32001L0083>
- <sup>a</sup> Polykretis P, McCullough PA. Rational harm-benefit assessments by age group are required for continued COVID-19 vaccination. *Scand J Immunol.* 2022 Dec 28:e13242. doi: 10.1111/sji.13242. PMID: PMC9877705
- <sup>a, b</sup> Verbeke R, Lentacker I, De Smedt SC, Dewitte H. The dawn of mRNA vaccines: The COVID-19 case. *J Control Release.* 2021 May 10;333:511-520. doi: 10.1016/j.jconrel.2021.03.043. Epub 2021 Mar 30. PMID: 33798667; PMID: PMC8008785
- <sup>a, b</sup> FDA Design and Analysis of Shedding Studies for Virus or Bacteria-Based Gene Therapy and Oncolytic Products Guidance for Industry August 2015 <https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/design-and-analysis-shedding-studies-virus-or-bacteria-based-gene-therapy-and-oncolytic-products-current-as-of-05/16/2019>
- <sup>a</sup> Vervaeke P, Borgos SE, Sanders NN, Combes F. Regulatory guidelines and preclinical tools to study the biodistribution of RNA therapeutics. *Adv Drug Deliv Rev.* 2022 May;184:114236. doi: 10.1016/j.addr.2022.114236. Epub 2022 Mar 26. PMID: 35351470; PMID: PMC8957368.
- <sup>a, b</sup> Capital, June 22, 2022 Sanofi launches clinical trial of first mRNA-based seasonal flu vaccine candidate (Sanofi lance l'essai clinique du premier candidat-vaccin à base d'ARNm contre la grippe saisonnière) <https://www.capital.fr/entreprises-marches/sanofi-lance-lessai-clinique-du-premier-candidat-vaccin-a-base-darnm-contre-la-grippe-1407163> accessed November 4, 2022
- <sup>a</sup> Moderna, mRNA pipeline, accessed February, 15, 2023, <https://www.modernatx.com/research/product-pipeline>
- <sup>a, b</sup> MODERNA AND MERCK ANNOUNCE MRNA-4157/V940, AN INVESTIGATIONAL PERSONALIZED MRNA CANCER VACCINE, IN COMBINATION WITH KEYTRUDA (R) (PEMBROLIZUMAB), MET PRIMARY EFFICACY ENDPOINT IN PHASE 2B KEYNOTE-942 TRIAL, DECEMBER, 13, 2022, accessed February 26, 2023 <https://investors.modernatx.com/news/news-details/2022/Moderna-and-Merck-Announce-mRNA-4157V940-an-Investigational-Personalized-mRNA-Cancer-Vaccine-in-Combination-with-KEYTRUDAR-pembrolizumab-Met-Primary-Efficacy-Endpoint-in-Phase-2b-KEYNOTE-942-Trial/default.aspx>.
- <sup>a</sup> ANSM (Agence Nationale de Sécurité du Médicament et des Produits de Santé), « Les Vaccins », consulté le 26 février 2023 <https://ansm.sante.fr/qui-sommes-nous/notre-perimetre/les-vaccins/p/les-vaccins-2>
- <sup>a</sup> <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27713225/> Wu KM. A New Classification of Prodrugs: Regulatory Perspectives. *Pharmaceuticals (Basel).* 2009 Oct 14;2(3):77-81.

11. <sup>a,b</sup> WHO guidelines on non-clinical evaluation of vaccines, Annex 1, TRS No 927, 1 January 2005, Meeting report <https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/nonclinical-evaluation-of-vaccines-annex-1-trs-no-927>
12. <sup>a</sup> Liu, M. A., Zhou, T., Sheets, R. L., Meyer, H., & Knezevic, I. (2022). WHO informal consultation on regulatory considerations for evaluation of the quality, safety and efficacy of RNA-based prophylactic vaccines for infectious diseases, 20-22 April 2021. *Emerg Microbes Infect*, 11(1), 384-391. <https://doi.org/10.1080/22221751.2022.2026742>
13. <sup>a</sup> FDA, 2007 Guidance for Industry Considerations for Plasmid DNA Vaccines for Infectious Disease Indications <https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/considerations-plasmid-dna-vaccines-infectious-disease-indications> November 2007
14. <sup>a</sup> FDA, 2013, Guidance for Industry Preclinical Assessment of Investigational Cellular and Gene Therapy Products <https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/preclinical-assessment-investigational-cellular-and-gene-therapy-products> November 2007
15. <sup>a,b</sup> Guerriaud M and Kohli E (2022) RNA-based drugs and regulation: Toward a necessary evolution of the definitions issued from the European Union legislation. *Front. Med.* 9:1012497. doi: 10.3389/fmed.2022.1012497
16. <sup>a</sup> European Medicines Agency. (2015). Reflection paper on classification of advanced therapy medicinal products. Available online at: [https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/reflection-paper-classification-advanced-therapy-medicinal-products\\_en-0.pdf](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/reflection-paper-classification-advanced-therapy-medicinal-products_en-0.pdf)
17. <sup>a</sup> EMA, 2007, REGULATION (EC) No 1394/2007 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 13 November 2007 on advanced therapy medicinal products and amending Directive 2001/83/EC and Regulation (EC) No 726/2004 <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:324:0121:0137:en:PDF>
18. <sup>a</sup> Moderna. QUARTERLY REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934 For the quarterly period ended June 30, 2020. 2020 Aug 6. (Accessed July 22, 2021, at <https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1682852/000168285220000017/mrna-20200630.htm>).
19. <sup>a</sup> Sahin U, Kariko K, Tureci O. mRNA-based therapeutics—developing a new class of drugs. *Nat Rev Drug Discov* 2014; 13:759-80. Epub 2014/09/23 <http://doi.org/10.1038/nrd4278>
20. <sup>a</sup> EMA 2006, COMMITTEE FOR MEDICINAL PRODUCTS FOR HUMAN USE CHMP GUIDELINE ON CLINICAL EVALUATION OF NEW VACCINES London, 18 October 2006 EMEA/CHMP/VWP/164653/2005 [https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/guideline-clinical-evaluation-new-vaccines\\_en.pdf](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/guideline-clinical-evaluation-new-vaccines_en.pdf)
21. <sup>a,b</sup> EMA 2016, 21 July 2016 EMA/CHMP/SWP/242917/2016 Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use (CHMP) Questions and answers on the withdrawal of the CPMP Note for guidance on preclinical pharmacological and toxicological testing of vaccines (CPMP/SWP/465) [https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/other/questions-answers-withdrawal-cpmp-note-guidance-preclinical-pharmacological-toxicological-testing/swp/465\\_en.pdf](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/other/questions-answers-withdrawal-cpmp-note-guidance-preclinical-pharmacological-toxicological-testing/swp/465_en.pdf)
22. <sup>a</sup> EMA, 2008, Guideline on the non-clinical studies Required before first clinical use of gene therapy medicinal products. EMEA/CHMP/GTWP/125459/2006 [https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/guideline-non-clinical-studies-required-first-clinical-use-gene-therapy-medicinal-products\\_en.pdf](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/guideline-non-clinical-studies-required-first-clinical-use-gene-therapy-medicinal-products_en.pdf)
23. <sup>a</sup> European Medicines Agency. Scientific Recommendation on Classification of Advanced Therapy Medicinal Products. Live Recombinant Lentiviral Vectors Encoding HIV Epitopes to be Used for Therapeutic HIV Vaccination of HIV-1 Infected Patients. Amsterdam: European Medicines Agency (2011).
24. <sup>a</sup> EMA, 2008 COMMITTEE FOR THE MEDICINAL PRODUCTS FOR HUMAN USE (CHMP) GUIDELINE ON THE NON-CLINICAL STUDIES REQUIRED BEFORE FIRST CLINICAL USE OF GENE THERAPY MEDICINAL PRODUCTS London 30 May 2008 EMEA/CHMP/GTWP/125459/2006 [https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/guideline-non-clinical-studies-required-first-clinical-use-gene-therapy-medicinal-products\\_en.pdf](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/guideline-non-clinical-studies-required-first-clinical-use-gene-therapy-medicinal-products_en.pdf)
25. <sup>a,b</sup> EMEA/CHMP/GTWP/125491/2006, COMMITTEE FOR THE MEDICINAL PRODUCT FOR HUMAN USE (CHMP), GUIDELINE ON SCIENTIFIC REQUIREMENTS FOR THE ENVIRONMENTAL RISK ASSESSMENT OF GENE THERAPY MEDICINAL PRODUCTS <https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/scientific-requirements-environmental-risk-assessment-gene-therapy-medicinal-products-scientific>
26. <sup>a</sup> Cellular & Gene Therapy Guidances <https://www.fda.gov/vaccines-blood-biologics/biologics-guidances/cellular-gene-therapy-guidances>
27. <sup>a</sup> USFDA, 2013, Guidance for Industry Preclinical Assessment of Investigational Cellular and Gene Therapy Products <https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/preclinical-assessment-investigational-cellular-and-gene-therapy-products>

- products
28. <sup>^</sup> *Biden's top-down booster plan sparks anger at FDA*  
<https://www.politico.com/news/2021/08/31/biden-booster-plan-fda-508149>
  29. <sup>^</sup> *Government Officials Pressured EU Regulators to Rush Authorization of Pfizer Vaccine, Leaked Documents Reveal* <https://childrenshealthdefense.org/defender/european-medicines-agency-eu-pfizer-vaccine/>
  30. <sup>^</sup> *Declaration Under the Public Readiness and Emergency Preparedness Act for Medical Countermeasures Against COVID-19, 03/17/2020, effective as of February 4, 2020,*  
<https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2020/03/17/2020-05484/declaration-under-the-public-readiness-and-emergency-preparedness-act-for-medical-countermeasures>
  31. <sup>^</sup> *Public Readiness and Emergency Preparedness (PREP) Act, Administration for Strategic Preparedness & Response, U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, accessed February 21, 2023* <https://aspr.hhs.gov/legal/PREPA/Pages/default.aspx>
  32. <sup>^</sup> *COVID-19 Contracts, Knowledge Ecology International (KEI)*  
<https://www.keionline.org/covid-contracts>, accessed March 7, 2023
  33. <sup>^</sup> *Le Conseil de Défense Sanitaire, Elysée website, accessed February 21, 2023*  
<https://www.elysee.fr/la-presidence/le-conseil-de-defense-sanitaire>
  34. <sup>^</sup> *Three questions about the Defense Council, a key body for managing the epidemic, Les Echos, October 29, 2020.* <https://www.lesechos.fr/politique-societe/politique/trois-questions...le-conseil-de-defense-organe-cle-de-la-gestion-de-lepidemie-1260216>
  35. <sup>^</sup> *PROPOSAL FOR A LAW to lift the defense secrecy of the deliberations of the Health Defense Council, February 8, 2022, National Assembly, France* [https://www.assemblee-nationale.fr/dyn/15/textes/I15b5003\\_proposition-loi#](https://www.assemblee-nationale.fr/dyn/15/textes/I15b5003_proposition-loi#)
  36. <sup>^</sup> *COUNCIL REGULATION (EU) 2020/521 of 14 April 2020 activating the emergency support under Regulation (EU) 2016/369, and amending its provisions taking into account the COVID-19 outbreak* <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32020R0521&from=EN>
  37. <sup>^</sup> *Council Regulation (EU) 2016/369 of 15 March 2016 on the provision of emergency support within the Union* <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2016/369/oj>

## Open Peer Review

[Review this Article](#)

**Brigitte Grandou** posted a **Review**  
April 5, 2023

...



<https://doi.org/10.32388/SE06US>

This article summarizes the unbelievable situation from authorities in any country concerning the registration of covid 19 mRNA vaccines. It is true that all in place regulations have been bypassed first by authorities themselves. Why these totally new medicines according to their mode of action have been authorised through fast track way in US and conditional use in EU whereas the covid 19 disease was not so serious, it remains a mystery on a regulatory point of view.

The authors state the need for more oversight throughout the vaccine development process. See more

👍 0    🗨️ 0    1 comment



**Kenneth Lundstrom** posted a **Review**  
April 5, 2023

...



<https://doi.org/10.32388/LT9WZ5>

## Regulatory Issues Concerning mRNA Vaccines and Gene Therapy

**Kenneth Lundstrom**

*PanTherapeutics, Lutry, Switzerland*

### Abstract

See more

👍 0    🗨️ 0    1 comment



**Rajib Bandopadhyay** posted a **Review**  
March 28, 2023

...



<https://doi.org/10.32388/C8AT1J>

Some suggestions regarding minor mistakes have been elucidated. Please go through the suggestions/comments listed below and modify accordingly -

1. In abstract portion, it should be grammatically more correct if the bolded portion in the sentence "However, mRNA vaccines, which represent a new class of vaccine, **should be subject** to more controls....." is modified to "**should be subjected**".

2. In Page 2; line no. 2- "Vaccines have been **exempt**" should be written as "Vaccines have been **exempted**".

See more

👍 0 🗨️ 0 1 comment



**Tafere Belete** posted a **Review**  
March 18, 2023

...



<https://doi.org/10.32388/NU51B5>

The paper is well organized, well written and ready for publication with minor editing from my point of view. The flow of thoughts and language are professional enough for consideration. The conclusion is compatible well written. My recommendation is to "accept" this article after minor change. The article briefly present regulatory issues related mRNA vaccine. This is interesting topic.

Although SARS-CoV-2 genome is a single-stranded RNA virus and not a retrovirus, recent studies showed that SARS-CoV-2 RNA genome can be transcribed into DNA and may be integrated into the human genome via retrotransposons. Besides, long-term safety of mRNA vaccines have not yet been fully clarified.

👍 0 🗨️ 0 1 comment



**Ger Rijkers** posted a **Review**  
March 9, 2023

...



<https://doi.org/10.32388/X6RJNN>

Helene Banoun addresses a timely and important issue, namely what is the regulatory status of mRNA based therapeutics, is it to be considered gene therapy or not. What is left out of the discussion, and could be included, that on average the development, testing, and regulatory trajectory of a given vaccine is 10-15 years. In times of COVID-19, this would mean that the first vaccines could come to the market in 2030-2035. I disagree with the opening statement of the abstract that vaccines escape some of the controls required for (other) human drugs. (I also wouldn't use the word "escape"). It would be strange that the

See more

👍 0 🗨️ 0 1 comment



**Asha Anand** posted a **Review**  
March 8, 2023

...



<https://doi.org/10.32388/GHZVFU>

The topic chosen by author is very much new and worth to discuss within the research community. The abstract could have been more short and crisp enough to deliver the information that author need to discuss through this review article.

👍 0 🗨️ 0

## Reviews to other version(s)



**Vikas Maharshi** posted a **Review**  
March 20, 2023

...



<https://doi.org/10.32388/D7ETC4>

Topic choosen is enlightening to the stakeholders and stimulates critical thinking. Only USFDA and EMA have been taken into consideration. Any other regulatory agencies having regulations for nucleic based products might also have been referred to, if any. The heading, why regulatory bodies did not review the mRNA vaccines thoroughly, is written after conclusion, which might have been written before it and with more humble title that does not point out regulatory bodies directly, because this is author's view and knowledge only, need not to be true in absolute sense. So, criticism should be there but in professional way.

Overall topic is worth with some corrections in language, punctuations and expanding the abbreviations.

👍 0 🗨️ 0 1 comment



**Dejun Ma** posted a **Review**  
March 8, 2023

...



<https://doi.org/10.32388/OCPXVM>



Some concerns are needed to be addressed.

1) The abstract and conclusion is too long. Does the author agree or disagree the regulation of mRNA drugs? The view should be clear.

2) As compared to DNA for gene therapy, the regulation of mRNA should be in principle very strict for many unknown issues, which will be further tested in the future. The possible reasons of strict regulation of mRNA drugs should be described clearly.

See more

👍 0 🗨️ 0 1 comment



**Shohreh Ghasemi** posted a **Review**  
March 6, 2023

...

☆☆☆☆☆ Preprint v1

<https://doi.org/10.32388/R0AGHH>

There is a novelty and great title in the manuscript but it is so generalized. In the abstract section, the authors can write a detailed more and it was written so general ... First, clarify and write about , the study's method . Next, write about the more issues, in discussion and expanded more to be more innovative and encouraging for readers , which might include tables or figures that are difficult to read, parts that need more explanation, I think the English language of the manuscript is suitable for publication but needs minor revision. . This will help both the authors and the readers , but anyway I do like the hot topic of MRNA vaccines.

👍 0 🗨️ 0 1 comment



**Federico Perche** posted a **Review**  
February 27, 2023

...

☆☆☆☆☆ Preprint v1

<https://doi.org/10.32388/F0WZLA>

The paper is well written and is an important point of view on mRNA therapeutics.

Authors follow the classification of mRNA as a prodrug and present limitations associated. More details on the types of RNA therapeutics could have been presented, for example on self-replicative RNAs, on circular RNA. In my opinion, a timeline of positions should be added.

👍 0 🗨️ 0 1 comment



**Tomás González Villa** posted a **Review**  
February 27, 2023

...

☆☆☆☆☆ Preprint v1

<https://doi.org/10.32388/3WJRBW>

An interesting review that should be posted, provided the english version of the manuscript is carried out.

👍 0 🗨️ 0 1 comment



**Karen Manoutcharian** posted a **Review**  
February 26, 2023

...

☆☆☆☆☆ Preprint v1

<https://doi.org/10.32388/7V7A5M>

In the current study, the author accurately outlined the legal/regulatory issues related to recently licensed Covid-19 mRNA vaccines. Although the conclusions and concerns are clearly right on, there are still several critical scientific issues that require clarification. Perhaps the most important: the initial promise and the milestone in success for these vaccines were their capability to protect against infection: these vaccines are not able to do it. Furthermore, the decision to give emergency use authorization has been made on highly questionable trial data where among thousands of vaccinated people a handful of them got

See more

👍 0 🗨️ 0 1 comment



**M. R. Mozafari** posted a **Review**  
February 25, 2023

...

☆☆☆☆☆ Preprint v1

<https://doi.org/10.32388/OGOHKB>

1. The abbreviation "EMA" is not defined in the Abstract.
2. The Aim of the manuscript is not clearly stated in the Abstract nor in the Introduction.
3. Wrong punctuations exist in the article on many occasions. For example:

"... influenza vaccines: ..."

4. Access Date for Reference 3 is not mentioned.

[See more](#)

 0  0 [1 comment](#)

[Review this Article](#)



[Editorial Team](#)[Conduct Policy](#)[Publishing Policy](#)[Archive](#)[Terms](#)[Privacy](#)[Contact Us](#)

Follow at [@qeios](#) 

© 2023 Qeios Ltd. All rights reserved. London (UK). | Qeios · ISSN 2632-3834 | Indexed in [Google Scholar](#) | Archived in [Portico](#) and [The British Library](#) | [CC BY](#) | 